

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action dated January 26, 2005 in the present application. In the Office Action, claims 2-27 were withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected species, claims 2-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite, and claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,933,019 to Depue. Individual issues raised in the Office Action are addressed next.

Claim Withdrawals and Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated September 1, 2004 in present application, the applicant elected with traverse claims 1-6 drawn to a test contactor and the species of Figure 2. In the present Office Action, however, claims 2-6 were withdrawn by the Examiner as being drawn to the non-elected species and further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner noted that it is not clear how the claims can be read on Figure 2, which is the Figure of the elected species. (Office Action at page 4).

In response, the applicant withdraws claim 6 from consideration but respectfully traverses withdrawal and rejection of claims 2-5 of the present application. In particular, the applicant submits that Figure 2 shows all elements of claims 2-5, and therefore these claims are improperly withdrawn and should remain in the present application. Moreover, claim 2 has been amended to recite all limitations of the canceled claim 1 and as such is generic to the dependent claims 3-5. More specifically, the amended claim 2 recites such elements as a conductive housing, a conductive spring, a conductive probe having a tip, a bottom and a locking projection. All these elements are shown in Figure 2: for example, conductive housing is identified by reference numeral 210, the spring is identified by reference numeral 220, and the probe is identified by reference numeral 230. Furthermore, the tip of the probe is identified by reference numeral 231, the bottom of the probe is denoted by reference numeral 232, and the locking projection is marked by reference numeral 233. Finally, an insertion restraint step recited in claims 4 and 5 is identified, for example, by reference numeral 211. In view of the above, the applicant submits that the amended claim 2 is generic to claims 3-5 and reads on the elected species of Figure 2. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the withdrawal and rejection of claims 2-5.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

In the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,933,019 to Depue (the Depue patent). Applicant respectfully submits

that claim 1 has been canceled, but claim 2 has been amended to recite all limitations of the canceled claim 1. This amendment does not represent acquiescence in the Examiner's rejections, but rather has been made to expedite the prosecution of the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims in continuation applications.

With respect to the amended claim 2, applicant respectfully submits that the Depue patent does not anticipate claim 2 at least because the patent fails to disclose a conductive probe having a locking projection projected between the tip and the bottom of the probe in a radial outward direction, as recited in the independent claim 2. In particular, Depue teaches a device comprising a plurality of "nails" for testing individual components or electrical functions of printed circuit boards. With reference to Figure 5 of the Depue patent, "nails" are spring loaded 46 pins with a sharp point 45 that contacts the circuit board 30 and typically plug into a socket receptacle 47 with a wire-wrap pin 48 on the other end. (See, e.g., col. 1, ll. 16-19 of the Depue patent). Depue, however, does not teach, disclose or even suggest that the testing pins have locking projections projected between the tip and the bottom of the pin in a radial outward direction, as recited in claim 2 of the present application. Accordingly, independent claim 2, as well as the claims dependent thereon, are patentable over Depue.

Likewise, neither U.S. Patent No. 4,443,756 to Lightbody et al. nor U.S. Patent No. 4,700,132 to Yarbrough et al., which were also cited in the Office Action, disclose a test contactor having elements recited in the independent claim 2 of the present application. Accordingly, claim 2-5 are believed to be patentable over the prior art of record.

On the basis of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. A favorable disposition to that effect is respectfully requested. Should Examiner have any questions concerning this submission, he is respectfully invited to call the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

No fee is believed due for this submission. Should any fees be required, however, please charge such fees to Jones Day Deposit Account No. 50-1013.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 26, 2005


For Brian M. Rothery (Reg. No. 35,340)
By Michael Fainberg (Reg. No. 50,441)
JONES DAY
222 East 41st Street
New York, NY 10017
(212) 326-3939